

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed January 12, 2007, the Examiner took the following action: (1) objected to claims 84 and 90 due to informalities; (2) rejected claims 1-10, 17, 19-46, 53, 55-78, and 82-83 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Teller (U.S. 2006/0031102); and (3) rejected claims 11-16, 18, 47-52, 54, 79-81 and 84-94 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teller in view of Luhrs (U.S. 2005/0132300). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### *I. Claim Objections*

The Examiner objected to claim 84 as being unfinished, and objected to claim 90 as failing to further limit the claim from which it depends (claim 84). Applicant has amended claims 84 and 90 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner.

### *II. Rejections Under §102(b) and §103(a)*

The Examiner rejected all of claims 1-94, either singly based on Teller under §102 (b), or based on the combined teachings of Teller and Luhrs under §103(a).

#### Claims 1, 21, 37, 57, 73, and 84 (and claims depending therefrom)

As amended, claim 1 recites:

1. A method for representing data associable with intervals, the method comprising:
  - associating a frame with each of a number of intervals in a period;
  - identifying a first data characteristic to be identified for data associable with the number of intervals in the period;
  - mining the data to identify a number of first significant intervals, the first significant intervals being intervals for which the first data characteristic is manifested in data associated with each of the first significant intervals; and

presenting in the frame associated with each of the first significant intervals a first representation of the data indicative of the first data characteristic, *wherein the first representation consists of either a first area boundable by a single rectangular perimeter, or a second area having a perimeter boundable by a pair of contiguous rectangles.* (emphasis added).

Limitations similar or identical to the above-italicized portion of claim 1 have been added to each of the other independent claims of the application (claims 21, 37, 57, 73, and 84). For the sake of brevity, in the following discussion, reference will be made primarily to the limitations recited in claim 1, however, it will be appreciated that these remarks may also apply, in whole or in part, to the other independent claims.

Teller (U.S. 2006/0031102)

Teller teaches systems and methods for detecting and monitoring human physiological information using a sensor configured to generate data indicative of the physiological information, a central monitoring unit that receives and analyzes the data, and means for communicating, storing, and displaying the data. (Paragraphs [0005]-[0006]; [0071]-[0073]). In relevant part, Teller teaches displaying such data, either individually or with other categories of data, in “piston levels” (*i.e.* bar graphs) over a user-determined interval, such as days or weeks. ([0073]; Fig. 11).

Applicant respectfully submits that Teller fails to disclose, teach, or fairly suggest the method recited in claim 1. Specifically, Teller fails to teach or suggest a method that includes “presenting in the frame associated with each of the first significant intervals a first representation of the data indicative of the first data characteristic, *wherein the first representation consists of either a first area boundable by a single rectangular perimeter, or a second area having a perimeter boundable by a pair of contiguous rectangles.*” According to Teller, the human physiological information is displayed in “piston levels” or bar graphs as shown in Teller’s Figure 11. ([0073]). Thus, while Teller teaches displaying information in a first area boundable by a single rectangular perimeter, there is

no teaching or suggestion in Teller of presenting data indicative of a first data characteristic in a first representation that consists of *a second area having a perimeter boundable by a pair of contiguous rectangles* as taught by Applicant and as recited in claim 1.

Luhrs (U.S. 2005/0132300)

Luhrs teaches color-codeable calendars. ([0005]-[0006]). According to Luhrs, color-coding of various activities enables a user to analyze and identify trends more readily than with words or non-color-related variables. ([0010]; [0004]). As best shown in Figures 3 and 4, Luhrs uses color-coded circles 60 over a selected interval to enable a user to analyze and identify information. ([0031]-[0033]).

Luhrs fails to remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Teller. Specifically, Luhrs fails to teach or suggest a method that includes “presenting in the frame associated with each of the first significant intervals a first representation of the data indicative of the first data characteristic, *wherein the first representation consists of either a first area boundable by a single rectangular perimeter, or a second area having a perimeter boundable by a pair of contiguous rectangles.*” According to Luhrs, data are represented by color-coded circles extending horizontally across an interval. There is no teaching or suggestion in Luhrs of presenting data indicative of a first data characteristic in a first representation that consists of *a second area having a perimeter boundable by a pair of contiguous rectangles* as taught by Applicant and as recited in claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Teller and Luhrs, either singly or in any properly motivated combination. Similarly, since the same limitation is recited in the other independent claims, all of the independent claims (claims 21, 37, 57, 73, and 84) are also allowable over the cited references. Furthermore, all dependent claims (2-20, 22-36, 38-56, 58-72, 74-83, and 85-94) are also allowable over the cited

references, at least due to their dependencies on the independent claims, and also due to additional limitations recited in those claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-94 over Teller and Luhrs.

Dependent Claims 12-13, 31-32, 48-49, 67-68, 80-81, 91, and 94

Furthermore, as amended, dependent claim 12 recites:

12. The method of Claim 1, wherein the at least one data characteristic includes *at least one of a vehicle maintenance event, a vehicle repair event, and a vehicle measurement.* (emphasis added).

Similarly, dependent claim 13 recites:

13. The method of Claim 12, wherein *the vehicle comprises an aircraft.* (emphasis added).

These additional limitations are also not taught or fairly suggested by Teller and Luhrs. Teller teaches displaying human physiological information ([0005]-[0006]), while Luhrs teaches displaying human behaviors (*e.g.* eating, drinking, jogging, smoking, etc.) ([0012]-[0013]). There is no teaching or suggestion in Teller and Luhrs of the additional limitations recited in claims 12 and 13, and thus, these dependent claims are allowable for these additional reasons.

Dependent claims 31, 48, 67, 80, and 91 recite limitations substantially similar to those in claim 12, and dependent claims 32, 49, 68, 81, and 94 recite limitations substantially similar to those in claim 13. Therefore, by analogous reasoning, these claims are also allowable over Teller and Luhrs for the same reasons as claims 12 and 13, respectively.

*III. Petition for Extension of Time and  
Authorization to Withdraw from Deposit Account*

Applicants herewith petition the Commissioner of Patents under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3) for a two-month extension of time for filing this response. Authorization is hereby granted to withdraw the necessary fees for this extension of time from Deposit Account No. 12-0769, to which any overpayments may be credited and any deficiencies may be charged.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-94 are now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining matters that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: June 12, 2007

By: Dale C. Barr  
Dale C. Barr  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Reg. No. 40498  
206-315-7916